

<https://helda.helsinki.fi>

Editor's note

Eräsaari, Matti

2019

Eräsaari , M 2019 , ' Editor's note ' , Journal of the Finnish Anthropological Society , vol. 43 ,
no. 4 (2018) , pp. 1-2 . <https://doi.org/10.30676/jfas.v43i4.83712>

<http://hdl.handle.net/10138/310512>

<https://doi.org/10.30676/jfas.v43i4.83712>

cc_by_nc

publishedVersion

Downloaded from Helda, University of Helsinki institutional repository.

This is an electronic reprint of the original article.

This reprint may differ from the original in pagination and typographic detail.

Please cite the original version.

EDITOR'S NOTE

It is with joy, and a bit of relief, that I present issue 43 (4) of *Suomen Antropologi: Journal of the Finnish Anthropological Society*. This issue concludes the 2018 volume of the journal, roughly half a year out of synch with the official calendar. But then, as Kevin Birth (2012: 35) has pointed out (in an unrelated context), calendars are 'tools by which the dead think for the living, and the dead's thought deflect the living's attention from the cycles of the present'. And with that thought, let me draw your attention to the present.

This issue presents a series of partial connections and overlaps. The topics discussed here range from future visions to the value of labour and the politics of culture difference—topics which, at first glance, share little common ground. Yet this issue is undoubtedly 'more than the sum of its parts' in the way its constituent parts add to one another.

The issue opens with Firouz Gaini's (University of the Faroe Islands) article 'Altered Islands: Young Faroe Islanders' Future Landscapes'. In the article Gaini argues in favour of a future studies approach that treats the future as a dimension of present-day concerns. Through an analysis of the near-future imaginaries of Faroese teenagers, the author highlights the 'simplified, exaggerated' versions of present-day concerns that are employed in the utopian and dystopian future visions constructed upon an 'infrastructure of uncertainty' that is particular to Faroese thinking. Gaini adds to a quickly growing body of anthropological literature that seeks to answer what kinds of questions we, as researchers, can propose to 'the future'. In more concrete terms, the future visions analyzed by Gaini are predominantly concerned with the continuity of culturally specific traditions and the family: the survival of the Faroese culture and language, on the one hand, and the constitution of the future family, on the other.

The high value ascribed to the family through these future projections connects Gaini's article to Tuomas Tammisto's (University of Helsinki) piece 'Life in the Village is Free: Socially Reproductive Work and Alienated Labour on an Oil Palm Plantation in Pomio, Papua New Guinea'. Tammisto writes about ideas of work, labour, and value as place-specific constructs which, he argues, seem to maintain their specificity precisely through the people's ability to traverse between places of 'work' and 'labour'. In Tammisto's terms, the Mengen of New Britain are a 'spatially oriented' society, who tend to use spatial relations as the preferred symbolic means for evoking complicated social phenomena. His analysis here, though, concerns the specific categories of wage labour and 'hard work', both with their associated value forms—roughly: money and kinship.

The discussion Forum edited by Heidi Härkönen (University of Helsinki) takes up the politics of representation, more specifically the recent case of a UK sociology textbook that was withdrawn following criticism over its portrayal of Caribbean families. Härkönen points out that the key problem seems to be the narrow 'bourgeois notion of respectability' that the Caribbean family is compared to. In the contributions that follow, Adom Philogene Heron (Goldsmiths, University of London) and Maarit Forde (The University of the West Indies) add historic and UK-specific layers to the discussion, thereby highlighting why, under what specific circumstances, this contrast came to be articulated and to whom. In a final commentary, Kevin Birth (Queens College, City University of New York) connects the issue to economic models that treat households as the fundamental economic unit while assuming an adult male as the primary wage earner. Birth's criticism of Arthur Lewis' idea of 'Economic Development with Unlimited Supplies of Labor', however, indirectly connects with Tammisto's analysis of the work/labour divide in Papua New Guinea. Both are indirectly asking questions about the worth of the work not compensated by the market economy, whilst the forum more generally connects with Gaini's work by foregrounding the time-and-place-specific value of the family.

The issue ends with three book reviews: Eeva Berglund (Aalto University) reviews *Anthropologies and Futures* (eds Salazar, Pink, Irving & Sjöberg), Suvi Rautio (University of Helsinki) reviews *Animism Beyond the Soul* (eds Swancutt and Mazard) and Benedict Singleton (Swedish University of Agricultural Science) reviews Megan Ybarra's *Green Wars: Conservation and Decolonization in the Maya Forest*.

Once again I would like to end by thanking the authors, editors, and peer reviewers whose contributions make the publication of this journal possible: thank you.

REFERENCES

Birth, Kevin 2012. *Objects of Time: How Things Shape Temporality*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan. <https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137017895>.

MATTI ERÄSAARI
EDITOR-IN-CHIEF